DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 566 95 SP 010 992

AUTHOR Pipes, Lana, Comp.
TITLE Validated Products from Theory to Practice.
INSTITUTION Bay Area Learning Center, Oakland, Calif.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 56p.; Report of Conference held at Bay Area Learning Center (Oakland, California), February 13-15, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; *Information Centers; Information Services; *Information Sources; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Bay Area Learning Center

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes and highlights the major formal activities and outcomes of the Bay Area Learning Center (BALC) conference. Two major areas of concern are (1) teacher centers and (2) knowledge bases. Excerpts from oral presentations, notes from reporters, summaries of discussions, and an interview with the BALC chairperson are presented. A list of conference participants is appended. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138566

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Validated Products From Theory to Practice

Conference Report
Bay Area Learning Center

Oakland California
February 13-15, 1977

SP0

Validated Products From Theory to Practice

Conference Report

Bay Area Learning Center
Oakland, California
February 13-15, 1977

JOHN FAVORS
Coordinator
Bay Area Learning Center

ROBERT MULLIGAN
Project Officer

ALLEN A. SCHMEIDER
Program Officer

U.S. Office of Education

Conference Sponsors:

Bay Area Learning Center
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, California 94619

U.S. Office of Education, Division of Education Systems Development
Washington, D.C. 20202

Published by:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

May 1977
SP 010 992

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of AACTE, the Clearinghouse, or the National Institute of Education.

VALIDATED PRODUCTS FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

	see page
FOREWORD	ix
INTRODUCTION	1

PROGRAM

Sunday, February 13th

12:00 - 7:00	Registration	2nd Floor Lobby	
1:00 - 7:00	Visit Displays	Hayward Room	
5:00 - 6:00	OPENING SESSION	Alameda Room	3

Welcome

Chairperson: Dr. John Favors
Coordinator, Bay Area Learning Center
Conference Chairperson

Mr. Robert Blackburn, Deputy Superintendent,
Oakland Unified School District

Mr. David Tucker, President, Oakland
Board of Education

Introduction of Speaker: Mr. Frank Schultz,
Associate Area Superintendent, Oakland Unified
School District

The University Is Alive and Well 3

Dr. Rhody McCoy, Director of Teacher Education,
University of San Francisco

6:00 - 7:00	No Host Cocktail Reception	2nd Floor Lobby	

Monday February 14th

7:45 - 9:00	Continental Breakfast	2nd Floor Lobby	
9:00 -10:15	GENERAL SESSION	Alameda Room	4

Welcome

The Honorable John Reading, Mayor of Oakland

Mr. Robert Mulligan, Deputy Assistant Regional
Commissioner, Postsecondary Education,
Region IX, U.S. Office of Education

	Future Trends in Education		4
	Facilitator: Dr. Marie Fielder, Berkeley Unified School District		
	Dr. Anthony Trujillo, Superintendent, Tamalpais Unified School District		
	Dr. Glen Houde, Superintendent, Elk Grove Unified School District		
	Dr. Laval Wilson, Superintendent, Berkeley Unified School District		
	Dr. Ruth B. Love, Superintendent, Oakland Unified School District		
	Question and Answer Period		
10:15 -10:30	Break		
10:30 -11:30	*The Emerging Role of Teacher Centers*	Alameda Room	8
	Introduction of Speaker: Dr. Yvette Del Prado, San Francisco Unified School District; and Dr. John Cleveland, Assistant Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District		
	Dr. Allen Schmieder, U.S. Office of Education, Chief, Support Programs, Educational Development Systems		
	Question and Answer Period		
11:30 - 1:00	Lunch	Alameda Room	
1:00 - 2:30	*Chairperson:* Dr. Robert Bush, Chairman of the Research Center for Development, Stanford University	Oakland Room	
PROGRAM 1:	*What Is the Knowledge Base?*		11
	Dr. Dave Berliner, Project Director, Beginning Teachers Evaluation Study, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development		
	Assessing and Utilizing the Knowledge Base		12
	Ms. Cheryl Chase, Northern Colorado Board of Cooperative Education Services		

How To Put It All Together 13

Dr. Greta Morine Dershimer, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Teacher Corps, Alum Rock School District, San Jose

PROGRAM 2: TEACHER CENTER ASSEMBLY Alameda Room 16

Chairperson: Ms. Kathleen Devaney, Teachers' Center Exchange, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

How a College of Education Can Nurture a Teacher: The In-School Advisory and the Curriculum Work Place 18

Ms. Georgia Delano, Workshop Center for Open Education, City College of New York

Community and Teachers' Partnership in a Teacher Center: Innovative Curriculum and Instruction Based in Environment 18

Ms. Harriet Cohen, Open Space Environmental Teacher Center, Los Angeles

Lessons for the Feds from an Independent Teacher Center: Teacher Initiation, Teacher Governance, Teachers' Programming 18

Ms. Harriet Bograd, The Teacher Center, Inc., New Haven, Connecticut

Teachers' Development of Multi-Ethnic Curriculum in a Teacher Center: Process and Product 19

Ms. Nancy Mayeda, Teacher Learning Center San Francisco - BALC

Working with Teachers and Working with Industry 19

Dr. Amity Buxton and Ms. Roberta Davis, Teacher Shelter, Oakland Unified School District - BALC

2:30 - 2:45 Break

2:45 - 4:15 DISCUSSION GROUPS ON KNOWLEDGE BASED PROGRAMS

PROGRAM 3: *The Role of ERIC and Other Information Retrieval Systems in Staff Development* Richmond Room 21

Chairperson: Dr. Audrey Guess, Coordinator of Curriculum and Staff Development, Oakland Unified School District

Dr. Karl Massanari, Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

PROGRAM 4: *Diffusion Networks and the Knowledge Base* — Atherton Room — 23

Chairperson: Ms. Jan Mendelsohn, President, Oakland Education Association

Dr. Robert Luke, Director, National Education Association of Research and Development Inservice Education Products

PROGRAM 5: *How State Departments of Education Use the Knowledge Base* — Castro Valley Room — 24

Chairperson: Mr. Walter Rowson, Principal, Montclair Elementary School, Oakland Unified School District

Dr. Roddy Harrison, Program Administrator, Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, Chipley, Florida

PROGRAM 6: *The Knowledge Base and Protocol Materials* — Fremont Room — 27

Chairperson: Mr. John Lievore, Administrative Director, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Oakland Unified School District

Dr. Don Orlosky, Professor of Education, South Florida University, Tampa

PROGRAM 7: *Making ERIC Work - Information Retrieval* — Petaluma Room

Chairperson: Mrs. Carol Worthington, Staff Development System, Oakland Unified School District

Hopkin Davies, Assistant Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

4:15 - 4:30 Break

4:30 - 5:30 TEACHER PREPARATION TIME — Alameda Room

"Hands-on" sessions where local staff and out-of-town guests engaged in the development of teacher center-type materials.

Tuesday, February 15th

7:45 - 8:30	Continental Breakfast	2nd Floor Lobby	
8:30 -11:30	GENERAL ASSEMBLY	Alameda Room	28
	Welcome		
	Mr. Ben Tom, Vice President, San Francisco Board of Education		
	Role Alike Discussion Groups		28
	Facilitator: Dr. Allen Schmieder		
10:15 -11:30	*Descriptions of Local Teacher Centering Operations*	Alameda Room	32
	Dr. Marie Fielder, BALC (Berkeley Section) Ms. Betty McNamara, TLC (San Francisco) Dr. John Favors, BALC (Oakland)		
11:30 - 1:00	Lunch (No Host)		
1:00	Bus departures for local site visits: Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco; return to the Oakland Hyatt House at 3:30		
4:00	Conference concludes		

STARTING A TEACHER CENTER 34

Dr. Karl Massanari interviews Ms. Nancy Bellard, Chairperson of the BALC Advisory Board

PARTICIPANTS 39

READER RESPONSE 45

FOREWORD

As the influence of teacher organizations has increased over the past decades, so has teachers' insistence on assuming a pivotal role in mapping their own professional development. Rather than rely solely on traditional academic instruction, many practitioners have opted for teacher centers as a way to obtain practical, needs oriented training in a supportive environment. The teacher center movement has progressed rapidly, enlisting adherents not only among classroom teachers, but also from the ranks of higher education personnel who recognize the merits of field-centered staff development.

The sharing of lessons learned and experiences gained in existing centers is essential to building an informational base for designing future centers. Prominent among the depositories of centering knowledge are the federally funded teacher center pilot projects in California, Texas, and Rhode Island. In their final year of support under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), the centers turned to ways to contribute their knowledge for the future development of teacher centers. The project directors decided on a series of conferences devoted to issues in planning and operating teacher centers.

This publication documents the structured and informal activities of the first of those conferences, "Validated Products from Theory to Practice," sponsored by the Bay Area Learning Center, a program funded by the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, as part of its effort to disseminate critical information within the areas of preservice and continuing education of school personnel, compiled the report from a variety of sources--prepared papers, summary notes by participants, and taped presentations and discussions.

The cooperation of all who contributed to the preparation of this publication is gratefully acknowledged. Dr. John Favors, BALC Director and Chairperson of the conference, coordinated on-site gathering of information with the assistance of BALC staff and planning committee members. Ms. Nancy Bellard, BALC Advisory Board Chairperson, shared her time and experience for an extended interview with Dr. Karl Massanari, Clearinghouse Director. Mrs. Lana Pipes, Clearinghouse Editor, compiled and orchestrated the materials. Staff members of BALC and the Clearinghouse helped in innumerable ways with production of the report. Dr. Allen Schmieder of the U.S. Office of Education lent his advice in the preparation of the final manuscript.

A reader response page at the end of this publication invites the submission of documents about teacher centers to the Clearinghouse for possible inclusion in the ERIC system. Comments about the publication itself also are encouraged.

Karl Massanari
Director, ERIC Clearinghouse
on Teacher Education

INTRODUCTION

Rapid growth of the teacher center concept has created a thirst for materials helpful in developing and improving teacher center programs. With recent federal legislation authorizing funds to plan, establish, and operate such centers, the need for useful, workable information can only increase.

The Bay Area Learning Center (BALC) in California is one of three pilot teacher center projects funded by the U.S. Office of Education, and the only regional model. The others are state network models--the Rhode Island Teacher Center in Providence, and the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems in Austin. For the past six years, these projects have been involved in pioneering the teacher center concept in the United States.

The BALC conference reported here is the first of a series sponsored by the pilot projects for the purpose of synthesizing centering experience about certain key developmental issues that all new centers will eventually need to confront. The BALC workshop was primarily concerned with beginning to find answers to the following questions:

--How can centers gain access to previous experiences?

--How can they validate/adopt/adapt previous experiences?

--How can they best develop their own instructional materials/processes where no previous experience exists?

In addition to providing a forum for these questions, it was expected that the conference would stimulate closer cooperation between teacher center networks and major information and development systems. Participants chose from four major program options:

Option One was research oriented, and emphasized validated products--sources, validation/adaptation/adoption problems.

Option Two concentrated on developing materials for teacher center programs.

Option Three provided participants with the opportunity to participate in the writing of a major conference report to be disseminated nationally.

Option Four consisted of site visits to teacher center programs: the Teacher Learning Center in San Francisco; the Curriculum and Instruction Resource Center in Oakland (which houses the Bay Area Learning Center and Teacher Shelter); and the Instructional Media Center in Berkeley (which houses the Berkeley Section of the BALC).

This report summarizes and highlights the major formal activities and outcomes of the conference. Excerpts from oral presentations, notes from reporters, summaries of discussions, and an interview with Ms. Nancy Bellard, chairperson of the BALC Advisory Board, are presented in essentially chronological order. An appended list of participants is intended to facilitate continued communication and exchange of information.

The publication has been prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education in cooperation with the Bay Area Learning Center, as a part of the endeavor to promote the translation of information into useful knowledge. An effort has been made to retain the informal, conversational tone of a conference; readers are urged to "listen with their eyes" to the give-and-take of the discussion and the varied styles and personalities of the speakers.

THE UNIVERSITY IS ALIVE AND WELL

Dr. John Favors, Coordinator of the Bay Area Learning Center, was chairperson for the conference, and welcomed participants Sunday evening. Dr. Rhody McCoy, Director of Teacher Education at the University of San Francisco, addressed the opening session on the subject, "The University Is Alive and Well."

Dr. McCoy characterized the teacher center movement as "a breath of fresh air, long overdue and needed," with the possibility of having a lasting effect in teacher education. The present shortage of jobs for teachers, he said, may actually provide teacher education an opportunity to "internalize and begin to look at what we're doing . . . refinement, remodeling, renovating . . . and when you do that, obviously you're looking at teacher centers."

The speaker briefly described the accusations, pressures, and constant conflicts that have marked education during his career spanning some thirty years, and the tremendous effect of two community forces--economic and political--currently impacting on the education process. He urged that teacher educators explore ways of influencing the thinking of those two communities.

Dr. McCoy noted a third community that also enters the picture: the commercial entrepreneurs, "the people who sell us textbooks. I have long believed that if teachers developed and wrote textbooks and resource books, the educational delivery capability would be enhanced." He saw great potential for using technology in the delivery of education, but stressed the need for planning to be in the hands of teachers rather than entrepreneurs.

Turning to the role of the university--and the schools of education and teacher training institutions particularly--Dr. McCoy said, "There still cannot be an effective marriage between the practicing teachers and the universities in the Bay area because there still is suspicion between the two, despite the fact that most of the teachers graduated from one of the schools in the Bay area.

"In the university, we are not sure which resources we should give priority. At present we are still setting up programs for the licensing process, and I'm not sure that's an adequate use of our resources.

"It seems to me the schools of education should have always been the buffer, the experimental ground on which education is conveyed to young people. Why haven't we done it? Because nobody has held us responsible. We're quite willing to graduate teachers, and then sever the ties. We're quite willing to do what we call staff development, and then sever the ties. What we need is an effective marriage that's lasting, because our clients are in fact school systems and teachers. I don't think it's appropriate any longer for schools of education anywhere in this country to remain aloof from the practitioner."

Dr. McCoy stressed the importance of considering not only equity of educational opportunity, but the quality of education also. "Equity talks about equality--spending the same amount of dollars on each child. In this case, we are going to lose--we haven't even begun to define quality. That movement could start in the teacher centers, where there are years and years of experience. We have to be part of that national movement of educators who are going to redesign education for the future, and take into consideration not only the clients but the quality of services as well.

"I think it's time we stop taking on the responsibility of solving all of society's problems. Most school systems in the country are still totally immersed in the problems of busing. All of us know it has nothing to do with education--as a matter of fact, it has created more problems.

"I urge you to give serious thought to new roles. The vehicle may well be teacher centers; I believe it is. It may well be the melding of schools of education and teacher centers. But in any event what we have to do as professionals is catch up with the advancing technology of society and give youngsters the skills needed to be citizens in this advanced society."

FUTURE TRENDS IN EDUCATION

Dr. Marie Fielder, Director of the Berkeley Section of the BALC, served as facilitator Monday morning for the General Session, a panel discussion by the school superintendents in the participating districts. Each superintendent, when introduced, briefly characterized the clientele in that district:

Dr. Anthony Trujillo, Tamalpais Unified School District: Wealthy, suburban "bedroom" community, mostly white middle class. In achievement, students rank in the 94-95 percentile.

Dr. Glen Houde, Elk Grove Unified School District: Suburban rural, very diverse student mix; 65 percent are bused. Not achieving at high percentile level. A poor district, 45 percent below the average per pupil expenditure of the state; gained in redistribution of education money.

Dr. Laval Wilson, Berkeley Unified School District: A pioneer system in the desegregation of schools and in implementing a cross-busing program. Student population 45 percent white, 44 percent black, 6 percent Asian, 3 percent Chicano, 1 1/2 percent "others." Also in the forefront of alternative education: the National Institute of Education (NIE) gave the district $6 million and

five years to explore some 22 alternatives; now eight or nine of these are being supported in the district by general taxpayer money. Very diversified, very active.

Dr. Ruth Love, Oakland Unified School District: Multiculture--black, Chicano, native American, Filipino (fastest growing minority). Releasing 300 teachers a week to work together to develop learning expectations for every grade level, for every subject. Greatest difficulty: underachievement by about half of students; thus the district has committed itself to doing something about the behavioral and academic performance of these young people.

Each of the four superintendents then offered a personal perspective of "Future Trends in Education."

DR. ANTHONY TRUJILLO

"Parents look at their youngster and the education they want for that youngster in a very simple manner. We in education look at the whole as a very complex thing. That gap is the problem.

"Consider the vocabulary we as educators have used on the public. Organization: comprehensive schools, year-round schools, open schools, free schools, schools within schools, schools without failure. Subject matter deviations: the new math, the new English, descriptive and generative grammars, ALM in foreign language, Black English. Philosophical movements that we went through: behavior modification, sensitivity training, humanistic education. Some wrinkles on organization: differentiated staffing, modular scheduling, team teaching, homogeneous vs. heterogeneous grouping, individualized instruction, diagnostic prescriptive learning, LAPS, career education. Management tools: PPBS, needs assessment, behavioral objectives, criterion referenced testing, accountability, decentralization, reform, contract management, and now Serrano-Priest. One thing that runs through this is, how confused are we and how much confusion have we caused?

"Collective bargaining--I keep saying, 'I can't deal with education, I have too many complex things to deal with, and one of them is called collective bargaining.' How much does our public really care about these issues?

"What is the parent thinking about? 'I want this youngster educated, and you tell me all these things, and I just want you to teach my youngster. You talk about accountability; all I want is a simple evaluation of that teacher, and if that teacher's not good in that classroom, I don't want her teaching my youngster.' And we say, 'But it's so complex to fire a teacher, you don't understand what you're talking about.' They say, 'You mean to tell me that all those people you have in the district office and in administration can't tell a good teacher from a bad teacher? You can't tell the difference, and you can't do anything about the situation?'

"I think the challenge we have in education is somehow to uncomplicate and deal with the simplicity of the education act, not impose our own complexity of organization on the public."

DR. GLEN HOUDE

"We're living in a peculiar era. On the one hand, everyone seems to agree that education of our young people is of critical importance. On the other hand, there's no institution so maligned as the public schools. We're accused of wasting the taxpayers' money; yet we're delivering education to each child in the district for about $6.77 a day, about $1.17 an hour. We're accused of not teaching the basic skills; the fact is that our schools have helped us become the most technologically proficient nation in the world. Our people enjoy a standard of living unmatched anywhere.

"My purpose in touching on criticism is to underscore the most crucial need for the improvement of education. For years we've talked about developing in these youngsters a healthy self-concept. We understand the terrible efficiency of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Let me suggest that the folks who desperately need to develop a healthy self-concept are not the kids; they're the teachers and administrators of the American public schools. When anyone is as heavily aware of failure as we are, the results are predictable. Accusations of waste, of incompetence, and of failure are believed by those against whom they're hurled.

"I believe we have to focus in any staff development program on development of our own healthy self-concept. When we really believe that what we're doing is important, when we understand fully that we succeed far more often than we fail, only then will we be able to do a better job, will we learn from our failures, and become more efficient and effective."

DR. LAVAL WILSON

"We're getting back to the question of basic education. After 1980 [California] young people will not be able to graduate without being able to pass some minimum competencies in arithmetic and reading and writing. Some other states are moving in the same direction. We've had in our school district a 6.5 percent population drop this year, and I expect each year a drop of about 6 to 6 1/2 percent. We've met with parents who had pulled their youngsters out of the school system, and it is very clear: parents want their youngsters to interact, they want homework assignments sent home, they want their youngsters to learn the basic skills.

"The return to the 3 Rs has some impact on curricular development across the country. Youngsters learn to read, I think, in a very haphazard way, a nonsystematic way. In most systems there's a patchwork curriculum, in reading, in social studies, in science, in history--no systematic curriculum from the beginning of school until the time they

leave. We're supposed to be teaching concepts not on a year to year basis; we're supposed to be teaching young people for life, how to succeed in life, instilling some basic academic skills that will allow them either to get into college or get into the world of work. I'd like to make sure that the skills we teach our young people thoughout the school system are articulated and that in each curricular area there's some system to the knowledge, procedures, content, techniques, so that teacher after teacher year after year can build on the basic blocks that have been introduced to young people.

"My pitch has always been that young people don't grow alike so why should they learn alike? I'm concerned about the individual differences of students. There should be differential learning objectives, materials, concepts of instruction, so that any youngster can find success in the classroom. This is going to require a lot of training on the part of the teachers. Most universities don't train their prospective teachers with enough skills to come out of school and work effectively in a school district. Universities can provide overall assistance to school districts, by consulting, but I think individual school districts should be their own 'universities'--and draw on the universities only for the types of consultants they want to help them in their own projects."

DR. RUTH LOVE

"I'd like to move public education off the defensive. It's important for us as American educators to know what we are doing and be able to communicate what we are doing that is positive and where we need to improve our programs. For about half the students in this country we do a good job; for the other half, let's face it--we fail them.

"I'd like to adopt the American Council on Education's notion that we move forward to basics; but it seems critical that we have a new definition of what basic skills are. I would include in addition to the 3 Rs the ability to communicate, self-concept, learning to respect others, to look at diversity in terms of differences not deficiencies, to understand how the informal and the formal systems work. It's important for teachers and administrators to know what they are supposed to teach, what the expectations are, to understand a variety of ways to reach those expectations, to have an evaluation system that is not a research document, that one can understand, and that gives feedback to classroom teachers. And it's important not to impose a commercial system on the classroom. We must develop our own programs and look to ourselves for the answers.

"We need also to delineate the role of schools. Educators always take on the responsibilities, but I think there are some services that ought to be taken on by agencies other than the public schools. We need to say to the public, 'These are your responsibilities.'

"It is a mistake to continue the adversary relationship between teachers and administrators. The public is asking us to educate their youngsters. They can see the adversary relationship diminishing the resources for their children.

"For teachers we have to provide many more opportunities for individualized staff development. In Oakland we have hired teachers to work with other teachers in the classroom. A real professional knows when help is needed, and that there is nothing wrong with asking for help. How do we release teachers each week to work on curriculum? We believe it's important and have set it as a priority in our budget. We pay for substitute teachers for the released teachers. We don't believe we should rely on federal and state resources, so we have made changes in the way we spend our regular budget.

"We need to provide basic guidelines within which teachers develop their curriculum, within which there is plenty of room for innovation and diversity of approach. In Oakland we have three major objectives: (a) ensure that, by the end of the third grade, a youngster is able to perform basic skills (my broad definition); (b) identify those who are underachieving and provide intervention to avoid repetitive failure; and (c) ensure that graduates leave school either with academic resources to go on to higher education or with a marketable skill. These seem so simple, but they are difficult to accomplish."

THE EMERGING ROLE OF TEACHER CENTERS

Dr. John Cleveland, Assistant Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, introduced the next speaker, Dr. Allen Schmieder, Chief of Support Programs for the Division of Educational Systems Development and Program Director of the new Teacher Center effort in the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. Cleveland saw a big problem in American education to be that "we are wrestling with problems that are worldwide, but we analyze them and respond to them from our own local and necessarily provincial perspective. In America, the problem becomes even more complex in that education is generally considered to be separate and distinct from economics and politics." He noted, however, that Dr. Schmieder has often said educators need to know what's going on outside education, and that education is a continually changing process.

Dr. Schmieder briefly described the federal government's involvement in the teacher center movement. He reported that the directors of the USOE funded pilot teacher center projects had decided in September 1976 to give priority in their final year of EPDA program support to (a) synthesizing the experience of the pilot projects and (b) helping to lay the foundation for some of the new programs that would emerge in the coming years.

"Though the new Teacher Center bill's specific requirements will result in centers which are different in some respects from those that now exist, they're going to confront many of the same problems: How do you assess needs? Should centers give priority to individual or system

needs? How do you best develop instructional programs to respond to identified needs? How do you free teachers up so they can participate at the best possible time? What kind of incentives are needed to get teachers involved? How do you increase and improve the teachers' contributions to training and curriculum development? How do you pay for programs? Should a center be a place or a concept? What is the best kind of governance? How do you measure program success?

"We need to examine carefully the lessons of existing centers. The major purpose of this meeting is to begin to articulate some of the ways in which future teacher center developers can best access previous experience. No matter what the educational concept, there is usually a considerable storehouse of good experience that can be built upon. In the case of teacher centers, the largest reservoir of good experience is, of course, held by the teachers themselves. Every teacher does something better than every other teacher. Finding ways to help them share these successes is one of the primary goals of the federal Teacher Center Program."

In reviewing the context in which teacher centers are developing, Dr. Schmieder called education possibly the largest single business in the nation. "Education is a huge, complex enterprise; it's not a place for the faint of heart. So what we need is not less research, but more research; not fewer teachers, but more teachers; not fewer kinds of education specialists, but an increasing array of experts to better meet the rapidly changing needs of American education."

He deplored the apparent inclination of higher education to withdraw in the face of the alleged teacher surplus and to accept demands for cutbacks in services and programs. "The more systematic, problem-focused, field-centered inservice education sparked by teacher centers should increase the need for higher education personnel. Higher education should also be expanding into a number of other important markets. There's just as much need for inservice education in the private sector as there is in the formal school sector, and our increasing mobility and global interconnectedness is creating a widespread and critically important need for help abroad."

The speaker saw three movements contributing to the emergence of teacher centers:

1. The organizing of the teaching profession, and the concern of teachers for their own professional development;

2. The movement of much teacher education into the field; and

3. The increasing use of staff development as an instrument of educational change.

The teacher center legislation was signed by President Ford on October 12, 1976, as an amendment to the Higher Education Act. Dr.

Schmieder said several things relating to the law's placement and designation could lead to some confusion:

1. The Teacher Center program is in the same section as the Teacher Corps, although it is separate legislatively and administratively.

2. Teacher Training Programs, Part B, contains two sections--532, the teacher center authorization; and 533, the retraining of higher education faculty program (not to be confused with the higher education part of 532).

3. $75 million was authorized for the whole of Part B, requiring division of any appropriation between the two sections--the legislation specifies only that neither part can receive less than 10 percent of the allotment.

"There's an important policy decision that hasn't yet been made regarding section 533: whether funds will support programs for any higher education faculty, or only for those from colleges and departments of education. Under the proposed regulations, all higher education faculty are eligible. One other difference between the two sections is that 533 projects must give priority to persons who have been disadvantaged by their racial, social, or economic background. There is no such stipulation for teacher centers."

The speaker emphasized some of the most important features of the teacher center bill. "One of the outstanding elements of this legislation is the supervisory board. It will have the major responsibility for developing and running the teacher center. There are specific requirements regarding its basic composition: at least 51 percent of its members have to be classroom teachers--employed regular classroom teachers; there must be one representative each from special education, vocational education, higher education, and persons selected by the school board (at least two--who could be teachers, higher education personnel, administrators, community representatives, etc.). A variety of educational types can be selected for the board as long as the final mix meets each of the minimum requirements set by law. Because of the board's importance in the whole teacher center operation, we're proposing that it be set up before a proposal is developed."

Dr. Schmieder outlined the process and schedule followed by the U.S. Office of Education in developing the regulations, and estimated they would be completed around July 1, 1977. The intention, he said, is to regulate as little as possible. "We're trying not to prescribe the kind of teacher center that should be supported--except to emphasize the importance of the governance structure and to point out that the writers of the law expect centers to focus on training or curriculum development or some mix of the two. Centers can serve a single school, several schools, a whole system, several systems, a whole state. They can cover a specific subject and level, or all subjects and levels. Proposals can be for planning, for operation, or for both." He added, however,

that centers administered by higher education institutions can only receive operational support. It is expected that IHEs will either propose the continuation of existing centers, with adjustments in their governance, or find some other source of funding for planning new centers. Grants can be for from one year to three years.

The importance of the State Education Agency in the program was stressed. Dr. Schmieder pointed out that SEAs would review and evaluate proposals, forward only those recommended, and then provide technical assistance (upon request) and dissemination services for projects eventually funded within their particular state.

He concluded his presentation by inviting individuals, institutions, and organizations interested in teacher centers to develop a close working relationship with the program at all levels of its operation. He asked them to monitor the USOE administration of the program and to share ideas, criticisms, and energies freely.

PROGRAM OPTIONS

Concurrent sessions Monday afternoon gave participants the opportunity to select among program offerings.

PROGRAM ONE

Acting as chairperson for this session was Dr. Dave Berliner, Project Director of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. Presentations were made by Dr. Berliner; Ms. Cheryl Chase, of the Northern Colorado Board of Cooperative Education Services; and Dr. Greta Morine Dershimer, with the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development's Teacher Corps Project, Alum Rock School District, San Jose, Calif.

DR. DAVE BERLINER: "What Is the Knowledge Base?"

"Based on previous work of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, an NIE funded project, I think that in the elementary grades we finally have some convergence about what is important for student learning. Across many different studies it appears that direct instruction is a model for achievement in elementary schools. By direct instruction I'm talking about a set of teacher behaviors focused on academic matters where goals are clear to students, time allocated for instruction is sufficient and continuous, content coverage is extensive and student performance monitored, questions are at a low cognitive level and produce many correct responses, feedback to students is immediate and academically oriented. The teacher controls the instructional goals, chooses materials appropriate to students' ability levels, and paces the instruction. Interaction is characterized as structured but not authoritarian. Rather, learning seems to take place in a convivial academic atmosphere.

"Studies report a negative correlation between teacher/student absences and achievement. Length of school day and time spent on a subject were the correlations relating to higher achievement scores in the subject--and the study showed that the length of the school day varies nationally as much as two hours. Taking the 180 days spent at school, reducing that amount to allow for sickness, time spent in parent/teacher conferences, strikes, and time spent on other than active learning shows that academically oriented instructional activities account for a trivial amount of the school year. The BTES study yielded estimates that reading and mathematics instruction per school year may well be under 80 hours per child per class--that's two weeks' work by adult standards. Even a 10 percent increase of this time is likely to have a greater effect on achievement than all other strategies.

"What we are saying is that students acquire more academic knowledge in classrooms where: the teachers and students have allocated time for academic instruction, the time used for lessons is continuous rather than disjointed, teachers are activity oriented rather than bound by the clock, and students are actively involved in instructional emphases. The more effective teachers in our study were those who concentrated more on academic outcomes. Academic activities and behaviors correlated positively with academic achievement; nonacademic activities in the class were negatively related to the acquisition of reading and mathematics knowledge. It has been suggested that nonacademic activities contribute to academic achievement by motivating students and offering indirect enhancement; but Rosenshine noted there were no nonacademic activities which yielded positive correlations with reading and mathematics.

"Also, higher order questions do not correlate well with reading; they correlate slightly with creativity. It depends on whether the goal is reading achievement or creativity.

"Monitoring student activities: the studies showed that in individualized classrooms, if students were closely monitored, the individual instruction was effective; if they were not monitored, it was not effective. In some classrooms a lot of students spend a lot of time doing nothing at their desks; it takes them 15 minutes out of 40 to get their contracts.

"An environment that stresses academic achievement and the points made in the BTES study need not be authoritarian."

MS. CHERYL CHASE: "Assessing and Utilizing the Knowledge Base"

"Teachers and administrators sometimes don't see the research information as usable. They have very definite ideas of what a resource is: they're interested in a resource only when they have a question or a problem, and they're interested in a particular resource only to the extent that the resource meets their needs. Many of us are resource givers; we spend a lot of time going out and telling everybody about a resource and working from the resource to the practitioner rather than from the practitioner to the resource.

"Organizing for effective resource utilization has two aspects: (a) looking at specific resources themselves, and trying to figure out how to organize them; and (b) looking at delivery systems. Questions from teachers and administrators are always the same: How much time does it take to use this resource? What kind of steps do I have to go through? If I go through all these steps am I reasonably sure I'll get the information I need? Is the resource in a format I can use? What are the procedures for using this resource? How much does it cost?

"It's important that there be communication between the people in K-12 and the teacher centers and the people at the universities, who have impact on how these resources are delivered. I'm trying to bridge the gap between those teachers who need the information and the universities trying to supply it. My perception is that a lot of the good work being done in the universities is not being used by principals and teachers and middle level administrators. We need to talk about some of the ways to get that information used more."

(Participants were invited to describe their own efforts to assure that the knowledge in their universities can be used by practitioners in local situations.)

DR. GRETA MORINE DERSHIMER: "Putting It All Together"

"I want to share with you a description of a Teacher Corps project in the Rogers Elementary School in Alum Rock, Calif. I'm going to concentrate on our inservice training program, and the two most important lessons that I've learned: you have to pick your spots, and you have to understand the facts of life.

Figure 1

FOCUS

SOURCES	Classroom Organization	Instructional Planning	Interactive Instruction	Classroom Observation
Tested Training Products	X	X	(X)	(X)
Teacher Sharing	(X)	X	(X)	(X)
Parent Involvement	X	(X)	X	(X)
Teacher Educators	X	X	(X)	(X)

"I believe that research findings and tested tra..ing products are most helpful when they are used in conjunction with other elements. Figure 1 presents a grid that represents learning possibilities for teachers. On the left are several of the most important sources of information, ideas, and assistance in any staff development program. Across the top are the four major areas of content in most staff development programs--where teachers want and need help.

"All the cells in this grid can be filled. We have validated training products available in each of the areas of focus. Teachers have information to share with each other in each area. Parents can provide input and assistance in each area. And teacher educators can provide some suggestions and instruction in each area, drawing on research findings as well as instructional theory and practical experience. But it will be a very rare teacher center or staff development program that can efficiently provide learning possibilities in every one of these 16 cells. What makes each of our programs unique, and effective, is that we can pick our spots; we can design a set of possibilities tailored to our own special situation.

"The circles on the grid represent the spots or cells that we have picked in our Teacher Corps project. First, let's take the cell which has tested training products as the source and classroom observation as the focus. Teachers at Rogers School use a thoroughly tested system for observation of pupil behavior, Coping Analysis Schedule for Educational Settings (CASES), developed by Robert Spaulding. Teachers identify pupils whose classroom behavior is a matter of concern--acting-out pupils, or distractable pupils, or withdrawn pupils. A classroom observer trained in the CASES system comes in to code the pupils' behavior in the classroom, to identify the style of behavior exhibited; then, using a tested set of 'treatments,' the observer makes suggestions to the teacher for new ways to interact with the pupils in order to increase desirable behavior. Using this system, teachers find that they can quickly see changes in pupils. Distractable pupils spend more time on task; withdrawn pupils become more outgoing.

"Next, let's take the cell which has teacher sharing as the source and interactive instruction as the focus. A group of five primary teachers who used different reading systems had decided that each of them would videotape a reading lesson and play it back, explaining to the group the procedures they were using and what they were trying to accomplish. They developed important insights about the similarities and differences in the systems they were using; they were surprised to discover that most of them were working to achieve very similar objectives, though using quite different materials and procedures.

"Now let's consider the cell which has parent involvement as the source and instructional planning as the focus. An illustrative activity would be the cultural assessment being conducted by one of our staff members, with the aid of our interns and team leader. Groups of parents who represent the various subcultures of the community are being brought

together and interviewed to determine how that culture is lived within the local school community. Each group works to describe important elements of their culture, such as diet, medicine, religion, family, home, customs and traditions, language, and attitudes. These descriptions can be used by the teachers as important content for the multicultural education program.

"Finally, let us turn to the cell which has teacher educators as the source and classroom observation as the focus. To assist teachers in examining their thinking, we videotape lessons, then play them back. We ask the teachers to stop the videotape at any point where they are aware of making a decision, or of thinking something important to the lesson. They talk about their reasons for responding in particular ways to pupils during the lesson, and what led them to make small changes in their plans in the middle of the lesson. Teachers report that this activity is making them more aware of the kinds of decisions they make, and the kinds of information they are attentive to while they teach.

"We have some evidence that this process of picking our spots has been effective. For example, when the project began, there were eight teachers who indicated an interest in working with us; now we have nineteen teachers involved. Last year there were almost no parents working as volunteers in classrooms; now over fifty parents come in on a fairly regular basis. Furthermore, we can see changes in classroom organization and classroom behavior. Teachers credit the support and assistance of the Teacher Corps project for these changes--though they recognize that the change has been brought about through their own efforts.

"But picking your spots isn't really enough. To run a successful teacher center, or staff development program, you have to understand the facts of life in a public school setting. These facts are that those of us who want to work with teachers have to be flexible, available, and credible, and we have to provide the time and the space for things to happen.

"Being <u>flexible</u> means providing many training options. At the moment we have four different teacher study groups organized.

"Being <u>available</u> means that we work on site, in the school, not in an office at the university. We are there when a teacher has an idea or a question, and wants to talk to us.

"Being <u>credible</u> means that we keep the hours teachers do, and we demonstrate that we can perform the tasks that teachers perform.

"Providing <u>time</u> means helping teachers to learn when <u>they</u> want to. Some teachers prefer to work during school hours; others prefer to stay with their classes, and work with us after school. We try to provide both types of opportunities.

"Providing space means having a place where teachers feel comfortable and where parents are free to drop in. Maintaining space can be quite a problem, for the more successful your program, the more crowded you become.

"That's how we put it all together. We've taken what we know from research, we've selected from among the available tested training products, we're using the knowledge of the teachers and parents with whom we're working, and we're trying to use ourselves, as teacher trainers, in the ways that make the most sense for the setting in which we find ourselves."

PROGRAM TWO

Ms. Kathleen Devaney, of the Teachers' Centers Exchange, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, was chairperson for this Teacher Center Assembly. Presentations were made by teachers' centers representatives: Ms. Georgia Delano, Workshop Center for Open Education, City College of New York, New York City; Ms. Harriet Cohen, Open Space Environmental Teacher Center, Los Angeles; Ms. Harriet Bograd, The Teacher Center, Inc., New Haven, Conn.; Ms. Nancy Mayeda, Teacher Learning Center (BALC), San Francisco; and Dr. Amity Buxton and Ms. Roberta Davis, Teacher Shelter (BALC), Oakland.

MS. KATHLEEN DEVANEY

Most of the teachers' centers with which the Teachers' Centers Exchange works grew out of the active-learning curriculum development movement of the 1960s, the informal education movement, and the need to create multiethnic curriculum and understandings, Ms. Devaney said. "These origins underline that the purpose of teachers' centers has been to give teachers practical help in implementing innovations. Centers also have grown up as mutual support places for teachers, and work places where teachers could custom-tailor curriculum materials for their own pupils: individualized materials, varied ways of teaching the basic skills, and of enriching skills with arts, crafts, and natural science. A teachers' center is a place, but it is also a staff who are non-supervisorial and non-evaluative in their support for the teachers, creative in their offerings of new ideas, and flexible and ingenious in ways of helping teachers. Teachers' center staff also are available to help teachers in the classroom, following up on what has been learned in the center.

"In great part, teachers' centers depend upon teachers' voluntary decision to come to the center and upon their expenditure of their own time. This is possible because a center combats the isolation and frequent sense of failure that many teachers feel. The staff and other teachers in a center will listen to problems, share successes, build on each other's energy. In most centers it is also possible to offer teachers the extra resources of community people who want to be involved in education.

"The Teachers' Centers Exchange is an information and referral center for and about teachers' centers, located at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in San Francisco. We are not ourselves a teachers' center, but rather communicators, responders, and "networkers." We can:

--Find answers for educators' (and laymen's) questions about teachers' centers and similar forms of staff development: tell about program and policy in experienced centers, refer inquirers to center leaders, make matches among people whom we perceive to hold common purposes and feel similar needs.

--Spotlight and circulate information, ideas, and themes; write descriptions of centers, case studies, articles, bibliographies. We will circulate information to those who have expressed a particular focus or problem.

--Arrange for meetings among teachers' centers people; facilitate visits to centers. We are also exploring the use of joint study projects, participation in institutes, and consultancies as ways to spread the word and practice of teachers' centers.

"The Exchange works to strengthen the existing spontaneous information exchanges among locally initiated teachers' centers, and to extend their communications to other educators exploring alternative forms of inservice.

"We are less than a technical assistance agency, because the expertise about teachers' centers is dispersed around the national 'network' of experienced centers. However, we are more than a clearinghouse, for we aim to extend the present network by putting people in personal touch with others of like premises, purposes, and problems.

"A shared premise is: Teachers must be more than technicians, must continue to be learners. Long-lasting improvements in education will come through inservice programs that identify individual starting points for learning in each teacher; build on teachers' motivation to take more, not less, responsibility for curriculum and instruction decisions in the school and the classroom; and welcome teachers to participate in the design of professional development programs.

"Amid rich variation in programming, setting, style, and structure, we find common purposes among this network of centers: (a) to respond to teachers' own definitions of their continuing learning needs with assistance and instruction that helps teachers enrich and activate the learning experience of the children in their own classroom; (b) to provide an environment where teachers may work on materials or projects for their classrooms, receive instruction individually and together, and teach and encourage each other; (c) to advise and assist teachers in their schools, working in the spirit of finding the teacher's own starting points for improvement."

MS. GEORGIA DELANO

"The Workshop Center for Open Education began in 1972 to serve elementary teachers as a curriculum work place to enrich their informal, individualized classrooms. Faculty members in the department of education at City College of New York (CCNY) are given release time to teach in the Center, and frequently they teach preservice students there.

"The Workshop staff has worked with faculty members to help them adapt their academic styles to meet working teachers' needs and find their 'starting points for renewed learning.' The Center welcomes principals, parents, community people (it is in Harlem), and occasionally children as participants in crafts, language, science, math, music, and other workshops, and in seminars on children's thinking and education issues in New York."

MS. HARRIET COHEN

"The Open Space Environmental Teacher Center began in 1969 when several of us in the Los Angeles community came together to provide a support system for education and to try to overcome the lack of good feeling in schools. With a small amount of funding the nonprofit independent group (Open Space) converted a warehouse to a storefront school. Subsequently, under Title III funding, the group created a teacher center which simultaneously provided a work place where teachers could make a curriculum and instructional center and program emphasizing the educational experiences to be found in 'the environment,' and a program sending advisors on enriching classroom and schoolyard environments to work with teachers and children in their schools.

"The Center's Title III funding expired in June 1976. In December 1976 it moved to Immaculate Heart College, in Los Angeles, and has resumed serving public school teachers with a small amount of support from state adult education subventions. The space is contributed by the college, and teacher center staff (still largely on a volunteer basis) are involving college education students and faculty in teacher center activities.

MS. HARRIET BOGRAD

"The Teacher Center, Inc., is independent from the school district but serves public school teachers, as well as independent and day care teachers in New Haven and suburbs. It dates from 1971, when two conferences were held on alternatives in education. A group began to work together, to run workshops and send out a newsletter, and by February 1972 they had received a grant from the Hazen Foundation. They moved to a church basement across the street from Yale, hired a three-quarter time coordinator, and began to operate as a full-fledged teachers' center. The policy board is composed of classroom teachers, parents, and community people."

Ms. Bogard is a lawyer who works part time on financial development for the center. In commenting on the proposed guidelines for the federal teacher center legislation, she was especially concerned about the parity that is to be established on the policy boards. She fears that people may become more involved in voting and policy haggling than they need to be. Nevertheless, she believes there may be opportunities for the center to work with the district, the intermediate district, and the state department of education, should there be funding for the teacher center program.

MS. NANCY MAYEDA

"The Teacher Learning Center, San Francisco Unified School District, began in 1969 with 12 elementary schools involved in a pilot desegregation program. A need was felt to provide a place for teachers who were seeking help in meeting desegregation problems. The Center came into being in 1971. Now the Center emphasizes multiethnic curriculum development and reading skills. TLC staff members work with teachers and with students in the Center--a former elementary school--and also maintain staff credibility by working in schools."

DR. AMITY BUXTON

"The Teacher Shelter, Oakland Public Schools, developed from a TTT program at San Francisco State University. Finding 'active learning' workshops in mathematics and science most effective with teachers, college trainers opened a storefront workshop center in math. This grew to a full center, the Teachers' Active Learning Center (TALC), which served San Francisco, Berkeley, and Oakland teachers and gained Ford Foundation support.

"When Oakland teachers began organizing a 'teacher shelter' within the school district, TALC staff consulted with the teachers' group and subsequently moved to Oakland as the Teacher Shelter staff. The staff develop curriculum for the specific teacher and class and help teachers observe and reflect upon what is happening in their own classrooms."

MS. ROBERTA DAVIS

Ms. Davis described the Teacher Shelter's resource center of recycled industrial scrap materials, which are made available to teachers along with instruction in how to make classroom materials from them. She also described the Shelter's new program of working with Oakland businesses to design a "world of work" curriculum with teachers.

(The rest of the afternoon was spent in responding to questions from the audience.)

AUDIENCE: How do Ms. Cohen and Ms. Delano feel about the restriction in the legislation that requires funds to go to LEAs?

DELANO: We already work with an LEA, and it's a good arrangement.

COHEN: It took us seven years to establish trust, but now the LEA supports us in what we do. The district uses us because the community and the teachers trust us.

AUDIENCE: The legislation carries the implicit assumption that teachers need to change.

AUDIENCE: That's one assumption. It also assumes that they will change. If we leave it to LEAs, will a center develop--will it work? Will it really change teachers?

AUDIENCE: Possibly competition will help--"my centers are better than yours"--and will lead to good centers.

DEVANEY: It takes time to get a policy board working together. The legislation stresses governance matters. We should look to see how much weight will be given to the adequacy of the leadership for the teachers' center. Without strong leadership, a parity board may be all you get.

AUDIENCE: How do you get people to come to the center?

MAYEDA: In San Francisco no monetary inducements are provided. If we hear properly and if we are really attuned to what teachers say, our programs have waiting lines. More than 50 percent of San Francisco staff are at the top of the salary scale, so salary increments are not an incentive. Release time is not available. Our biggest incentive is that teachers trust us.

DELANO: We change the calendar every month, offering fresh ideas. But we also meet the requirements of the board of education for compulsory inservice. This attracts some teachers. Some principals bring their entire staff to the center for staff meetings. They do this because they want to expose teachers to the Workshop Center.

BUXTON: Word of mouth is our best advertising. A teacher brings a teacher. We respond to our teacher advisory group's ideas on what is needed. We can also give some graduate credit for teachers.

DEVANEY: What do you think about release time--the school district providing time for staff development during the school day?

DELANO: That's not possible now--there's too little money.

MAYEDA: Some teachers really want help in their classrooms. We don't think limited funds should be spent for release time.

AUDIENCE: Closing the school a half-day monthly may help the release time problem.

AUDIENCE: Any preservice work in the centers?

BOGRAD: We have state college cooperation. The faculty has volunteered to teach workshops for us, and we welcome their preservice students to our center.

DELANO: Preservice students at CCNY are participants in the Workshop Center.

COHEN: The faculty at Immaculate Heart is very excited about having us on campus. We're exchanging resources and expect to cooperate in many ways.

AUDIENCE: Do you have any cautions or concerns for colleges--how could we communicate with faculty to reduce fear or threat?

DEVANEY: At least 51 percent of the policy board must be teachers. This may be a problem for the colleges. Also, the colleges will probably worry over a lack of intellectual depth in the courses in a center.

BUXTON: There's a money threat and that's why we're not at San Francisco State anymore. Teachers come to us for inservice rather than to the colleges.

DELANO: The teachers' centers serve as social centers for teachers. For example, we were very useful during the firing crisis. We had a number of teachers who had lost their jobs volunteering in our center, and we helped them find jobs.

AUDIENCE: If I were a teacher and came to your center and asked you for more structure, what would you do?

BUXTON: We would help you. We would find out what you mean by needing "structure," what is happening in your classroom that is telling you that you need structure. A good teachers' center also identifies where other resources are and arranges for them to be available to teachers.

PROGRAM THREE

Programs Three and Seven were combined into a single session to consider "The Role of ERIC and Other Information Retrieval Systems in Staff Development." Dr. Karl Massanari, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., chaired a panel with Hopkin Davies, Assistant Director of that Clearinghouse, and Debbie Byron and Emily Raskin, both of whom were staff members of the former ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources at Stanford University (now located at Syracuse University).

Panel members gave an overview of the ERIC system's efforts in the collection of fugitive educational resources, acquisitioned into two data bases: Resources in Education (RIE), which indexes education documents (obtainable in either microfiche or xerographic form); and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), which reports articles in over 700 education journals (obtainable from original publishers). They said three major types of resources are not found in ERIC: (a) copyrighted books (with a few exceptions), (b) nonprint media, and (c) doctoral dissertations. The panel also discussed other Clearinghouse services, such as responding to user inquiries, producing information analysis products,* and disseminating information at all levels of education.

*Among information analysis products available through the Clearinghouse on Teacher Education are Teacher Centers March 1977, an indexed bibliography produced in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education; Governance of Teacher Centers, a monograph by Edward L. Dambruch and others; Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene by Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger; and Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information (1972), by Lorraine Poliakoff.

The problem of how to communicate and disseminate education information effectively has been compounded because the knowledge base is constantly expanding. ERIC was established by the National Institute of Education (NIE) as a network to help with that task, and is presently adding documents to the RIE file at a rate of 1200 per month. There are no plans for "purging" the ERIC files to discard out of date or little-used documents; however, each user may limit the material retrieved, especially during computer searching, by specifying documents within a recent time span, and by careful refinement of topic and elimination of irrelevant descriptor terms.

The ERIC System consists of a policy making and program monitoring group housed within NIE - Central ERIC; 16 decentralized Clearinghouses; a central processing and reference facility; a document reproduction service; and Macmillan Information Inc., publishers of CIJE.

Each of the 16 ERIC clearinghouses has a different scope. The Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, for example, has responsibility for acquiring and processing documents on the preparation and continuing development of school professionals. Other clearinghouses cover subject disciplines, education levels, and educational problems.

Relating ERIC to the concerns of the conference, the presenters noted that the questions are: (a) how can teacher centers gain access to previous experience, and (b) how can they validate and adapt that experience for their own needs? ERIC can report the previous experience as the basis for replication and more extensive pilot testing. Teacher centers may in turn help to show teachers that ERIC has practical information.

Mr. Davies noted that teachers, the educational subgroup with the most need for quick, easy access to relevant information, appear to be the group with the least time for, and knowledge about, information handling. In addition, the wealth of wisdom residing in the collective and individual experience of the nation's teachers remains largely inaccessible, he said. "It is important that teachers, as well as other education professionals, recognize and fulfill their professional responsibility to participate in the development of a sound knowledge base by contributing to, utilizing, and refining the information base."

Whereas inexpensive microfiche readers exist which could enable teachers to read ERIC microfiche at home, the larger problem is for teachers to find the time to keep current with developments in their profession. Dr. Massanari pointed out, however, that another way to utilize information systems at the school level is for school personnel with responsibility for staff development to monitor the needs within their schools. He also said many researchers are involving practitioners in the planning and design of research projects in the field; often school personnel see such action research as more immediately practical to them than "pure" research.

"After spending a number of years developing an information resource for education, the federal government is now turning to ways for practitioners to make use of that resource," Mr. Davies said. "The biggest component of the National Institute of Education right now is the Dissemination Resources Group. In a couple of years you'll see less importance given to the construction of the knowledge base, because we're beginning to feel we have that now; what we don't have are adequate communication channels from the federal and state information centers to the local school level."

Using a portable computer terminal, Ms. Raskin and Ms. Byron demonstrated the capability for searching the ERIC data bases for information on a particular subject.

PROGRAM FOUR

Ms. Jan Mendelsohn, President of the Oakland Education Association, introduced Dr. Robert Luke, Director of the National Education Association's Project on Utilization of Inservice Education R&D Outcomes.

DR. ROBERT LUKE: "Diffusion Networks and the Knowledge Base"

Dr. Luke reported on one diffusion network and one sharply defined knowledge base. The network is the National Education Association, an organization with a national headquarters, 50 state affiliates, and over 9,000 local associations. The knowledge base described is made up of "transportable" inservice training programs developed as a result of recent educational research.

The NEA's network/knowledge base dissemination program is one of seven projects funded by the National Institute of Education to stimulate the increased use by schools of research-related educational materials. The project is collaboratively operated in six pilot states through 30 local pilot programs. In each of the cooperating states, both the state association and the state department of education have appointed a staff member to facilitate the work of the program in the local sites.

Each product entered into the system:

--Is directed toward practicing teachers, although some of the products could be used by those who are preparing to be teachers

--Emphasizes knowing how to do something instead of knowing about something; attempts to move theory into practice

--Requires active participation rather than passive behavior

--Is a result of research and development activities by R&D organizations, colleges and universities, special projects, commercial publishers, and individual educators

--Can be used independently of persons associated with the development of the product, although some require a leader who is familiar with the material

--Is available for purchase by (or rental to) any educator or school in the country.

Several participants questioned whether the definition of "knowledge base," as illustrated by samples of product descriptions which were distributed at the meeting, is sufficiently rigorous to exclude materials which might not be fully validated. The response was that the definition of "R&D" extends over a very long continuum and that the extent of field-tested validation of products currently being entered into the dissemination system does, indeed, vary widely. Participants in the seminar were invited to send to the project materials that could be brought to the attention of teachers through the NEA network.

Questions were also raised about the project's role in evaluating the effect of products in changing teacher behavior or "improving" inservice education. The response indicated that, while it is hoped these benefits will accrue, the research base emphasis of the program is a detailed study of the employment of dissemination and utilization processes.

A description of a product appraisal procedure indicated that an important element of the program is the distribution to teachers of information about opinions teachers hold concerning products they use. Continued work must help teachers find and identify inservice education programs that meet their perceived needs and that can be installed without undue complexity by the local school system.

PROGRAM FIVE

Dr. Roddy Harrison, Program Administrator of the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative in Chipley, Fla., prepared a paper entitled, "How State Departments of Education Use the Knowledge Base."

DR. RODDY HARRISON

"The Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative grew out of an early recognition by the superintendents in the area of the advantages of cooperation. Long before the PAEC came into being, individual counties in the Panhandle area were cooperating in areas of mutual interest, such as shared media centers, testing programs, and special education. In

July, 1967, nine counties joined together in a proposal for what was to become the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative. That proposal was approved, and a grant of $103,000 was awarded under ESEA Title III.

"PAEC was organized early in 1968 under the leadership of the nine county superintendents, who were designated as a Board of Directors. The PAEC staff now has 15 full-time professionals and 12 full-time support staff. An Advisory Committee made up of lay persons, members of the Florida Department of Education (FDOE), and representatives from the nine counties meets semiannually to advise on all activities and assist in interpreting the services of PAEC to the communities.

"PAEC now administers the following programs or projects:

1. Vital Information for Education and Work. VIEW, funded by the FDOE Vocational Education Division, provides students with occupational information on 485 careers found in Florida, and has surveyed every state supported vocational-technical school, community college, and university to ascertain where "training"--programs or courses--can be found for these occupations. This information is distributed on microfilmed cards to any school/district subscribing to this service. Currently VIEW is in 64 of 67 Florida school districts. The project put microfilm reader-printers into all PAEC junior and senior high schools at no cost to the districts.

2. Florida Learning Resources System. FLRS/PAEC, one of 18 associate centers of FLRS, ensures extension of district services to exceptional child educators in the nine districts within its area and provides instructional support services to exceptional child programs in the nine districts.

3. ESEA IV-C. The PALS project, A Model for Exceptional Child Education, is both a set of mathematics materials and a system for their use. Materials for pupils and teachers focus on mathematics instruction for mentally handicapped students aged 10 years to adult. The 60 Packets to Assist Learning (PALS) include titles in the several areas of basic skills, as well as in consumer education and personal survival skills. An ESEA Title IV-C grant has been approved for assisting other school systems to adopt or adapt the project materials and/or procedures.

4. NIE, Florida Facilitator Center. The National Institute of Education has provided grant money to test a model of linkage from developers of exemplary programs (R&D) to users of products (schools). The model will be tested in 5 of the 14 Teacher Education Centers in Florida, and will be adopted statewide if successful.

5. PAEC Health Education Project. In the school year 1974-75, each of the nine counties was awarded a planning grant under the Comprehensive Health Education Act of 1973. The districts chose to work cooperatively through PAEC to develop this plan. A K-12 Health

Curriculum Guide, along with teacher-made material packets for grades K-8 in the areas of Nutrition and Mental Health, have been developed and distributed to all K-8 teachers in the PAEC area. These materials are available to other districts in the state through purchase from PAEC.

6. PAEC Teacher Education Center. PAEC was a "teacher center" before teacher centering came into existence in Florida. Resources for operation of the Teacher Education Center come from three sources: (a) $3 per FTE from each district participating, with the district controlling the expenditures; (b) grants; and (c) consultant resources available from Florida State University, University of West Florida, and Florida A&M University. A council (23 members) composed of district representatives, a majority of them teachers, meets once each month for decision making.

7. Cooperative Testing Program. A cooperative general achievement testing program had been in operation for several years prior to PAEC, but is now a function of the PAEC operation. This cooperation results in a reduced cost for testing and provides the participating districts with an accessible student data base.

8. Cooperative Purchasing Agency. The Paec Cooperative Purchasing Agency Agency is an effort to provide materials and supplies to each of our districts at a lower cost: PAEC bids on behalf of each district through a pool-purchase plan. Savings to the district during the first six months of operation were as much as 48 percent for office and instructional supplies; efforts now are being made to add audiovisual, janitorial, and athletic supplies to the inventory. As each district demands and uses this cooperative purchasing plan, more inventory and savings will be available.

9. VIEW Supplement. To help defray the cost of the VIEW program, a charge for the microfilm is made to the subscriber schools. These monies become the base of the next year's VIEW budget. The total budget in a given year is the supplemented budget plus the monies funded by the state. The 1976-77 year subscription charge per user school is $100; in 1977-78 we hope to lower this to $75 and be able to maintain it at that level.

10. TETIT. TETIT is a locally developed program providing many types of services to the nine PAEC member districts, other Florida school districts, other educational agencies, and the FDOE, such as:

    a. Contracted services to counties in the PAEC area and to the Division of Youth Services in monitoring, writing, and evaluation of ESEA Title I projects

    b. Consultative services to the PAEC counties at the district, school, or individual teacher level in areas of expertise not provided through the districts' full-time professional staff

    c. Printing services to the PAEC counties at a reduced rate

d. State center for the distribution of teacher education materials, sold at cost plus a percent for labor and production

e. Coordinating and implementing comprehensive programs in Exceptional Child Education, finance, inservice, property records, and other areas

f. Microfiche services to districts at a very low cost for materials and production

g. Technical assistance provided districts at no cost upon request by the full-time professional staff.

PROGRAM SIX

Dr. Don Orlosky, Professor of Education at the University of South Florida in Tampa, spoke on "The Knowledge Base and Protocol Materials." He discussed bridging the gap between theory and practice, and saw theory as having three elements:

1. It explains some kind of phenomenon by calling aspects of the phenomenon by some name.

2. It involves a set of words.

3. These words are linked together by a certain rule of operation.

If a theory is proven valid, conclusions are then made either empirically, by asking questions, or by an experimental research design.

If we deal with validated theories, then the research in education can have a payoff, Dr. Orlosky said. Whereas theories are powerful in the physical sciences, in the social sciences there is a need to increase the probability of the usefulness of theories. Educational theories need to be tempered to the complexity of the problem.

The educator must recognize and diagnose the environment of the theory; this is one prerequisite to the professional teacher's training. The other dimension of teacher training is to make the decision to deal with the condition diagnosed. We therefore need: (a) conceptual knowledge and concepts of educational problems, and (b) the teachers' skills to deal with the condition diagnosed. Dr. Orlosky defined protocol materials as those used to diagnose--to classify and analyze the concepts; training materials are those used to teach the skills.

Describing his experiences in developing protocol materials, he said that, to be useful, protocol materials should be produced in 16mm color film with sound; production costs are therefore high--about $1,000 per minute. "However, protocol materials have clearly resulted in positive results: (a) on task learning, (b) increased achievement, and (c) lessened disruptive behavior."

ROLE ALIKE DISCUSSION GROUPS

Dr. Allen Schmieder was facilitator Tuesday morning as participants worked in discussion/writing groups to record their individual perspectives. The following comments and suggestions are reported by those groups. Because these were "brainstorming" sessions, the reports consist of random, discrete contributions, some representing individual remarks and others recommendations of the group.

I

This session dealt with the needs of a teacher center and what a center can be....There is a clear mandate in terms of the way education will go. There are a knowledge base and a number of validated products that will assist us (for example, the Far West Lab; the center in Chipley, Fla.; minicourses; the USOE booklet; the two-volume series of NIE). There are a number of things related to teacher competencies. ....Vocational education has done considerable research.

One of the functions of the learning center ought to be as a resource base....Teachers want to improve. We need a systematic approach to validated products that teachers can use....Teachers are hungry for information; we need better organization and structure to get the data to them.... Lines of communication need to be improved; teachers need to be able to share experiences....Grants, forms, paperwork are totally worthless to the classroom teacher.

Needs assessment is not a product but a process. It is not studying teachers, students, products; it is an individual matter--a single problem....Most current needs assessments are superficial and don't get to the necessary needs. We first must focus on professional growth and development, on school needs....Before attacking a needs assessment, you need to have a knowledge of pedagogical skills....Someone has to analyze alternatives continually....The job of a resource center is to provide the teacher with the process, provide data to increase awareness.

Any outside supportive group needs to establish trust in the teacher....Support and follow through are the two basic ingredients.... Most teachers are better equipped than college professors; the college classroom has lost contact with the real world of the elementary/secondary teacher and classroom....The key focus should be on working in the field with the teacher....A center is not a place, but a concept.

II

Discussion of difficulties in getting teachers to go to centers: readiness must be created....Teachers have more input in centers now. The emphasis is on teachers training each other....If teachers are going to change, they must be convinced that the change is for the good and is permanent....In getting teachers to change their modus operandi, work from the teacher's strengths and observed data; let individual teachers

choose what they want to change....Teacher center staff members need to develop relationships with as many people as possible; on site; go to teachers' rooms; do a mini needs assessment....Districts should have committees to collect information; you really have to hustle to keep up with information as it comes out....Schools need to find out what they're really trying to do. Teachers will change their behavior if they can get information and followup about changes.

Information is of value in proportion to the way it's personalized.... There is a potential for cumulative knowledge: do a few things well, and the information will last and collect from year to year....A teacher center is a place to provide information and assistance....The best way to work is a "ripple effect"; it is longer but more effective....Teachers respond much more readily to attempts to make changes in pupils' behavior.

III

Contributions to the knowledge base: Visit other teachers as interns....Recycle college administrators and faculty....Pull together community people who have knowledge base, and catalog knowledge base for community....Stimulate interaction and establish rapport....Encourage collaboration between colleges and classroom teachers....Build incentives for sharing knowledge....Theoretical or scientific knowledge retrieval.... Assess cognitive and affective needs.

Teacher centers bind universities to school districts in a cooperative effort....They gain access to informal data, disseminate it to LEAs. Dissemination--through writing, interviews, and taping....Data collection requires a number of visits, measures of teacher change, etc....Seek funds for continuation of an idea....A consortium for field study research--a union of school district and college to acquire funding for dissemination.

Access to previous experience: staff development/curriculum development specialists act as contact people....Differentiated networks are a system for gaining knowledge of center concepts....Validate teaching via research models....Articulation between school districts and colleges/universities....The question is: How do you translate research based knowledge for people in the field?

IV

Concerns: What is the rationale of the need for teacher centers? Needs were not being met in higher education. The "feds" are saying, "We are taking control."....Best kind of inservice is having teachers involved on a needs assessment basis....Human Resource Talent Bank: people ask for help, a team comes in, and followup occurs through evaluation. People must know exactly what they want and what they expect to achieve....Inservice is better than preservice: control needs to be shifted from IHEs to LEAs....The public schools have not monitored

themselves as well as have the IHEs. IHEs are being criticized for not being accountable and producing educated people; teachers want control.

We should be accountable for the process, and we do not control all the variables involved....There is no change occurring in the self-image and attitude of teachers and administrators: teachers who have poor attitudes and no respect or dignity must be dealt with....Process vs. product: process is not working; we must look at product. The process seems fine in some cases, but the kids are not le.rning, so what do we do? Then the product must be considered. We must be accountable for the product.

We have been remiss in individualizing education in teacher education, and thus we have failed. We assume that once through higher education, they can teach....We need to take teachers where they are individually and work with that....How are we going to provide resources for these centers? Realistically speaking, professors involved must be qualified.... Higher education will look to teacher needs and then work from there.... Recognize that USOE jumps on bandwagons, and also that we all want federal funds as well as being altruistic....Is there an empirical base for a teacher center besides the English base? --No empirical data because the product is not great....The priority should go to central city schools because they face unique problems. --I disagree; rural and outlying areas need help, too, and they do not have staff development agencies.

Competency-based education is one way; the teacher center is NEA's answer....Universities did not train teachers properly and we must begin....Teacher attitudes are part of this....Master teachers need to be given a chance to teach. Let them be a part of this, since they are aware of what it means to teach. Higher education people do not need to teach kids....For example, vocational education programs are quite successful; they are using master teachers, who have been successful, to teach others.

Teacher centers need to be developed for each area: What do we want to accomplish? What can we do that is not being replicated at the university?....The impact of teacher centers will be through inservice.... Will you be able to change the teacher?....Tenure may have to go, in LEAs as well as IHEs. A recertification plan or professional growth may be the answer.

The appropriated federal money sprinkled around the country is not enough. It should be spent on a minimum of centers strategically located, set up for four or five years, and with specific emphases or models.

It's hard to focus on the knowledge base of teacher centering. The information base is huge; the knowledge base is shaky. What exists in teacher centers is the experience base, and it is usually a person.

Recommendations: Drop the words "knowledge base" until there is one; use instead "informational base."....Give available information about all teacher centers....Give equal parity for research and development in LEAs and IHEs; have at least half that money go to higher education for staff development....Have regulations focused toward evaluations.... Evaluation must come from within, not from the federal government.

Information needs to start a center: Have a directory of teacher centers, staff development programs, curriculum development centers.... Really spell out what goes on in a center, what the center's objectives are, which objectives are not duplicated in higher education....Have consultants from higher education and master teachers, too....Make some move toward accountability for teachers.

V

Knowledge base: There is no single model of teacher centers, but certain commonalities should be identified....Deep needs should be identified, not just surface needs....University personnel need to be aware of purposes of teacher centers, for staff development....Teacher centers must be aware of consumer needs, and prepare faculty to meet those needs....Universities working with districts have better opportunities to assess, implement, and continue a developing program.... Universities are concerned about finances and survival; they feel the need to be involved in inservice....Teacher centers exist because universities are not giving teachers what they need, so they establish their own programs....The problems: process of development, challenging existence, transitory existence, the same people "staff" the program.... Question: Are teachers "trying to build another empire" (in comparison with higher education and administrative personnel)?

Suggestions: Make a formal request that <u>Learning</u> magazine start a section on teacher centers....National associations should encourage skill development among their members for working with teacher centers.... Commitment should be made formally to teacher centers where a certain percentage of faculty can be involved....Is there a written plan of action for the personal/professional development of higher education faculty who participate in teacher education programs?....Act as a supportive program.

General ideas: Since teacher education is attacked from so many aspects, there is a need to draw perimeters....Teacher education is a larger organizational program including innumerable avenues of activities.

DESCRIPTIONS OF LOCAL TEACHER CENTERING OPERATIONS

In a wrapup session prior to departure for local site visits to the three sections of BALC in Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco, Dr. John Favors, Dr. Marie Fielder, and Ms. Betty McNamara described local teacher centering operations.

DR. JOHN FAVORS

"The Bay Area Learning Center began about 5 1/2 years ago as one of four federally funded teacher center projects, three of which are still operating. We work with an advisory board composed of representatives of teachers, administrators, and community people from the three school districts served, and with a board of directors composed of the three district superintendents and myself as BALC director.

"Our operations are divided into a number of suboperations:

1. In San Francisco, the permanent Teacher Learning Center

2. In Berkeley, the Berkeley section of the BALC

3. In Oakland, there are numerous activities and involvement in curriculum and instruction, including the Teacher Shelter operation.

"All of these are conducted jointly with the school districts. In addition, we are currently dealing with specific needs identified by local clientele, such as issues in special education through training labs, and special training for school administrators. We have operated additional programs through private foundation funds."

DR. MARIE FIELDER

"In the School Desegregation/Resegregation Project just underway, a three-year program funded by NIE, we are taking a look at what is happening in second generation and post-desegregation problems. We need to look at new emphases, in terms not only of priorities but also in response to the bombardment of pressures from the decline of students, loss of income, and the exodus of 'white blue-collar and black white-collar' families to suburbia and what such shifts mean to the teacher, the parent, community, and the student body.

"The teacher is the leader. Where we have had difficulties in desegregation, the battle was lost in the coffee klatch. The flip side of this is that the teacher is important in setting the tone. It's more difficult now, but we're working with teachers, trying not to do a hard sell but rather to put the program on a broader base, as an educational program.

"We hope also in this study to use youngsters as participant observers, as consultants to see what's happening in the school as a community: What are the informal social systems operating among students and teachers? What are the youngsters learning in the school that the teacher is not teaching?

"The major goal is to approach desegregation/resegregation with a focus on human beings and humane processes as we prevent, or at least retard, the movement toward resegregation."

MS. BETTY MCNAMARA

"Educators are going to have to deal with the political realities of the Pell legislation [on teacher centers]. The governance board will be a primary concern because it will have a 51 percent teacher majority. The thinking of the university types scares me. They are overly concerned about validated practices and research, and as a result are already eroding the humanism which is the very heart of teacher centering. They are neglecting the centering concept which was born out of the need for more humanism in education.

"The 'humanism' in centering cannot be validated as other concepts are validated. When human beings are in the process of making change, it is difficult to measure when and if any change occurs. Learning is an interaction process. Six months, possibly a year may elapse before the internalization process manifests itself.

"In the school district structure it is the upper midmanagement group that must be convinced that the centering concept has merit, not superintendents and not school boards. The major function of the boards and the superintendents should be a supportive one. This is extremely important because the constituencies we are serving today are broader, and the awareness for the acceptance of centering must come from that constituency. Teachers must take responsibility for their own retraining. They haven't been given this opportunity in the past, so their skills in this area may be limited; they must be given training before being required to accept the accountability factors.

"Teacher centers can and should excite teachers about their profession and its importance. Higher education can play an important role. Most teachers are practitioners; they have long ago forgotten the theory. They need the blend of the practical with the validated theory to make a more meaningful impact. The exciting part of centering is that it has tremendous flexibility and the potential to turn on the whole education society. It really doesn't matter what model is used; only believers can develop a strong program. The quality will depend on how much they are willing to give in time and energy."

STARTING A TEACHER CENTER

Dr. Karl Massanari, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, interviewed Ms. Nancy Bellard, Chairperson of the Advisory Board of the Bay Area Learning Center, about the difficulties encountered in planning and developing a teacher center. Some of the characteristics of the development of BALC are unique, in that USOE's original requirements included a call for collaboration among three quite different school districts and the use of an external management support team to help coordinate the first phase of planning.

* * * * *

Could we explore the planning that took place prior to the startup of the BALC, back about 1972?

A group of dreamers--at the federal and at the university level--got together, and their explorations and dreams resulted in federal guidelines for a teacher center. The Bay Area planning group did not quite know what a teacher center would look like; since we were the only federal teacher center funded at the district level we spent some time devising an approach for a teacher center in a school district. Also the grant funding was tri-district--San Francisco, Berkeley, and Oakland. The grant allowed one year of planning prior to the startup of the center. A planning group composed of parents, teachers, educators, community people, and students designed what they thought a teacher center should look like, whom it would serve, etc. The group, later called an advisory body, felt it would be helpful to have a group of management consultants--a management support team. The criteria for agencies to bid for this contract specified that they had to represent the major ethnic groups--white, black, Asian, Chicano--in the San Francisco-Oakland-Berkeley school districts. The grant language referred to the major ethnic groups; the planning group in turn defined what was major for us. The contract was awarded to a firm from Chicago with offices in San Francisco; that firm in turn formed a consortium with two other firms. The contract firm did not itself represent all the ethnic groups, but the consortium included the major ethnic groups we had identified. I was later to be a co-chairperson of one of the three committees. Each chairperson had a consultant team at her elbow. The team assigned to my committee trained me for several months almost on a one to one basis. After they had completed the contract with BALC I had their services for a couple of years by picking up the telephone.

How long did you employ the management consultant team?

I think they had the contract for about six months.

From your description of the makeup of the team, you had a newly created entity for a specific purpose. What was your experience in working with the newly formed group?

The management support role, as I look back on it, was to bring us into line, so that we could move along together to reach the goal of designing plans for the implementation of the Bay Area Learning Center.

What were the major contributions of the management team as a group of people interested in starting a teacher center?

I can tell you how they helped me, and I'm still reaping the benefits from the management support service. I was pretty much a greenhorn, and did not know the first thing about planning, how to move a group of people forward on a project, and I could not read the climate very well. I had, seated around me at all times, a group of people who were trained in Robert's Rules of Order, strategies, and reading the climate. Also, they could anticipate the next move of the group. They always had us on target, and they kept us and the agenda moving. They helped me facilitate--they were my support team. Their approach was to focus the group so as to enable us to develop our problem solving skills. As a result, the group did not come to a solution too soon. The management team would then write up what the committee had developed, so that the following session would act as part of a built-in review process. They also helped in the selection of individuals to be placed at the next stage. When we got ready to expand the advisory committee, they conducted interviews based on demographic and racial data, so that the individuals who would come on the advisory board would be representative of the makeup of our three communities.

For those people who may be contemplating the planning of a teacher center and who may be giving some thought to employing a management consultant firm, will you talk about the extent to which an external agency such as a consultant firm, working with a local mix of people who are committed to a common purpose, had credibility and was accepted? For example, when you received counsel from one of the consultants, was this interpreted in any way as outside meddling?

Yes and no. Yes, because we had all sorts of infighting, and it was often against the consultants. And no, because as part of our established procedures the total advisory board was aware that all chairpersons and their co-chairpersons would be meeting with the management support team and their particular consultants for training. I had an excellent management group because when the committee that I was working with would get a little ruffled or displeased with the point of view of the management support team I was automatically informed, "Go with your group." Also, the management support team made every effort to create an open environment. Any individual in that group felt safe enough to challenge me or any other member, and they knew they would not be ramrodded into a decision which they could not tolerate.

Why did you have several chairpersons?

After the group was expanded to 50-60 people, the large number was too unwieldy to get any work done, so they divided us into three different task groups. Each group had a co-chairperson. In the general sessions a co-chairperson chaired the sessions dealing with that committee's assignment. We all had specific tasks. Once the task was done by the

subgroup, it was brought back to the full advisory council for their consideration and action.

Will you describe the role of the Advisory Council, what its responsibilities are?

From the time of my training by the management support team I had begun to believe more and more that my role as advisory chairperson should be facilitative. I was also warned that once I committed myself to be a facilitative type of chairperson, I could not step over the line to participate actively in meetings. As a facilitator I would create a climate for listening, allow all sides to be heard, advance the agenda, and at the same time try to recognize when the advisory board was moving out of the advisory or recommending capacity and moving into administration.

Undoubtedly, there must have been times when you were frustrated in performing the facilitator role, and you would rather have dropped that role and been an active participant in the issues and the discussion.

Many times, but I don't think I showed it too much. I was never really in a participatory role, even when I did not chair the meeting, because the role of chairperson is a powerful role. Realizing this I was always overly cautious. I would raise questions on both sides of the issues, to make sure that everyone was heard, so that my role with the advisory body has been to allow someone else to bring out the particular issues, and not to initiate; instead, to make sure that everyone is heard.

If a group in some other community is interested in taking steps to initiate a teacher center, how important is it that they have a basic understanding of the makeup of the community--the demographic characteristics, the socioeconomics, and so on?

I think it's important to make some kind of effort to take all the sections of your community along with you, which means that you of course have to know who makes up your community. If you want to have a project with community input it might be easier in the beginning stages, before you even get that project off the ground, to solicit the suggestions and thoughts of all the various fragments in your community. When it is time to implement your project, you know pretty much where everyone stands, you're all generally moving in the same direction, and then your community is more likely to buy into it. By the same token, when you as project people go to your community and ask for its input, do not be unwilling to make changes. Remember you are in a negotiating process, and I would say, negotiate like crazy. What are the tradeoffs? You must be aware of them. To identify our community, the advisory group recruited friends, and identified groups from the newspapers and media. I was surprised to learn, for instance, that most of the Spanish-speaking people in the Bay Area are not Chicanos, but are from South America. To our surprise, BALC had planned a program without any South American participation. Also, there are not just Chinese and Japanese, there are Filipinos as well. That community that we had been calling Asian and Chicano was made up of more complex identities. So then we talked

about Hispanic, we talked about American Indians. Also, the management support teams went to the planning offices in the various cities. These offices periodically put out reports on ethnic compositions and gave us all the information that we needed on the makeup of our community.

So you used more than just the network of person-to-person contacts?

Yes, we used the baseline data--these kinds of people are in this community, therefore we need these kinds of folks to represent us. Those planning reports are very interesting; they tell you where a community is moving.

What would you list as major accomplishments, particularly of the advisory council?

The advisory body found that it could negotiate, not only with the federal government, but with the district and our evaluation team. Our voice did matter. The problem you are always facing with advisory bodies is that sooner or later they forget they are advisory and begin dealing with administration problems. However, as an advisory body we found that we could have an impact. Another success would be the building into each of the districts a need for the particular services offered by each of the sections. Then when the BALC brought the director on board, we did not create another district to run parallel to the other three, but instead attached the center to the existing structures. Also, I think this was a tremendous training ground for some people.

The fact that there is a BALC in operation today is another success.... What were some of the hard lessons you learned?

We learned that different groups on the advisory board had different expectations for the BALC, which meant that we had to contend with hidden agendas. Coalitions were formed, some people left as a result of winning or losing their coalition's positions. I would have hoped that the Berkeley component would have had more of an impact in Berkeley, and could have done more. This component functioned, but never really became a full-blown staff development center that serviced all of Berkeley. Also we were always hampered by lack of personnel, which is another way of saying that we lacked operational funds to really do something. I would have preferred not to have quite the turnover on our advisory body. We did try to ensure against this by saying that one third of our board would be permanent. Another disappointment to most advisory board people was that San Francisco did not participate after several years--it was like a curtain being dropped and we were shut off from San Francisco. Berkeley and Oakland people could never quite understand what was happening in San Francisco. Another thing: if we had to rethink, we would think long and hard about how the relationships should function between the director of the BALC and the superintendents of the three districts. Another failure is that somewhere along the line the advisory board lost their contact with the superintendents. Then there was of course the political environment--you must pay attention to politics. I would probably like a BALC to come along in the absence of

other kinds of competitive forces. The BALC was developed in the midst of the civil rights struggles. Teacher centering is moving into another stage and the BALC may not survive if it is not refunded. A five-year commitment is a long commitment, but we were on declining funding and knew that at the end of a certain number of years there would be zero money. The BALC is an information network, but people have to learn how to set up and design information networks. The three districts were always three separate entities, held together by the director. Because of the separation, you did not want to be disloyal to your district. None of the three was. But how do you reconcile the differences while trying to set up an information network? I think an advisory body or the planning committee should think through this extremely important detail. Unfortunately, we put our emphasis in other areas.

As others begin to think about starting teacher centers, and if the consortium approach is one option, they ought to think through very carefully the alternatives. The consortium approach clearly has some advantages, but it also has some disadvantages, and that's what you're pointing out. What will happen when the funding runs out in June?

I think that each district will absorb its own BALC component. The concepts are still there, the mechanisms are already set up, so that each district will take unto itself the concepts of t BALC. How they implement those concepts, if they'll set up a separate staff, I don't know. Some districts are in financial difficulties. Some districts may be able to keep their center as a separate entity, so that you can identify that this was the BALC; in other districts there may be no identifiers except to say, "this person worked on BALC."

You're saying that after June, the basic structure is more likely to become three separate centers rather than a single structure.

Yes, if funding does not continue, BALC probably will not be coordinated and pulled together as that single structure.

If you were to give counsel to many people who are going to be thinking about teacher centers in the next year or two, what are a few important things you would like to tell them?

(1) Bring your community group together before you set up your program with your director. (2) Make sure that you are establishing a network and not a physical entity. It is possible that the BALC will survive if we have been successful in establishing a communication network. For instance, in Berkeley if there is a group of teachers or administrators who want some training in a particular area, I can get on the telephone and call Oakland and ask, "What are you doing in this area? I'd like to bring some people down." The network will be there.

Then it's also a sharing of resources?

Yes, if people remember that other people have resources also, and that we can all use them, then BALC will have succeeded.

PARTICIPANTS

This list of participants was developed from the application forms of those in attendance, and the local committee's knowledge of participants in attendance who did not file a registration form. The list should enable participants to maintain contact with each other.

GERTRUDE ABERY
Professional Development Center
42 Charter Oak Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

LUCILLE ABRAHAMSON
San Francisco Board of Education
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

ORAL L. BALLAM
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

JOHN E. BELL
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281

NANCY BELLARD
Berkeley Unified School District
1414 Walnut Street
Berkeley, CA 94709

DAVID BERLINER
BTES
Far West Laboratory for
Educational Research & Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

ROBERT BLACKBURN
Deputy Superintendent
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

ARVIN C. BLOME
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax
Denver, CO 80203

HARRIET BOGRAD
The Teacher Center, Inc.
425 College Street
New Haven, CT 06511

CLAIR BOWMAN
Boise State University
1910 College Boulevard
Boise, ID 83725

VIRGINIA BOYLE
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281

ELAINE BROCKBANK
President, Tamalpais Board of Education
109 Crown Road
Kentfield, CA 94904

BILL BRUCE
Route 1, Box 173
Waverly Hall, GA 31831

JOHN T. BULLOCK
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

PAUL J. BURKE
Saint Mary's College
Department of Education
Moraga, CA 94606

AMITY BUXTON
Teacher Shelter
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

MARGARET CHAMBERS
California State University at Hayward
25976 Hillary Street
Hayward, CA 94542

CHERYL CHASE
3295 Longwood
Boulder, CO 80303

GLORIA CHEW
5988 Margarido Drive
Oakland, CA 94618

JOHN CLAGETT
Eastern Montana College
Billings, MT 59101

JOHN CLEVELAND
Assistant Superintendent
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

HARRIET COHEN
Open Space/Environmental Teacher Center
Immaculate Heart College
Administration Building, Room 211
2021 Northwestern Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90027

JOHN L. CRESWELL
University of Houston
3801 Cullen Boulevard
Houston, TX 77004

HOPKIN DAVIES
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

ROBERTA DAVIS
Teacher Shelter
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

EDWARD L. DEJNOZKA
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Box 688
Omaha, NB 68101

GEORGIA DELANO
Workshop Center for Open Education
City College of New York
New York, NY 10031

ROBERT DENBY
University of Missouri at Kansas City
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64110

GRETA MORINE DERSHIMER
Far West Laboratory for
Educational Research & Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

KATHLEEN DEVANEY
Teachers' Centers Exchange
Far West Laboratory for
Educational Research & Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

CLYDE EARNHART
12111 West 23rd Place
Lakewood, CO 80215

RUTH EGGOLD
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

JOHN FAVORS
Project Director
Bay Area Learning Center
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

KATHRYNE FAVORS
Berkeley Unified School District
38 Crestmont Drive
Oakland, CA 94619

MARIE FIELDER
Berkeley Unified School District
1414 Walnut Street
Berkeley, CA 94709

JAMES R. FILLBRANDT
Kern High School District
2000 24th Street
Bakersfield, CA 93301

HOWARD M. FORTNEY
Callman County Teacher Corps
Route 14, Box 65
Callman, AL 35055

MARVIN J. FRUTH
University of Wisconsin
1025 John Street
Madison, WI 53706

EUGENE U. GEORGE
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

ELAINE GRADY
San Francisco Unified School District
500 Corbett Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94114

HERBERT M. GRAW
California State University at Hayward
25976 Hillary Street
Hayward, CA 94542

DAVID M. GREENE
California State University at Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

JOSEPH J. GREGORY
Teachers Association of Baltimore County
305 East Joppa Road
Towson, MD 21204

ROBERT GRINDER
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281

AUDREY GUESS
Coordinator of Curriculum and
Staff Development
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

PATRICK HARRISON
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

RODDY HARRISON
Route 4, Box 49-H
De Funiak Springs, FL 32433

BRUCE HASLAM
1926-B Johnson Ferry Road, Apt. 302
Atlanta, GA 30317

HELEN HATCHER
Teacher Learning Center
500 Corbett Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94114

ALAN B. HENKIN
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

JOHN HILL
3866 Antoinette Drive
Montgomery, AL 36111

ROICE HORNING
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

GLEN HOUDE
Superintendent of Schools
Elk Grove Unified School District
Elk Grove Boulevard
Elk Grove, CA 95624

OSCAR JARVIS
Dean of School of Education
University of the Pacific
3601 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95211

WILLIE JEFFERY
Bay Area Learning Center Staff
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

KENNETH JOHNS
College of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 89507

BURNETT JOINER
Southeastern Teacher Corps Network
Atlanta University
223 Chestnut Street SW
Atlanta, GA 30314

CRAIG KISSOCK
Division of Education
University of Minnesota
Morris, MN 56267

PAULA KLEIN
115 West Lincoln, Apt. 4
Spearfish, SK 57783

AUDRA KNIGHT
Bay Area Learning Center Staff
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

EARL LEGGETTE
Teacher Corps
Jackson State University
Box 17446
Jackson, MS 39217

ROBERT LEMONS
1010 Sunnyside Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32304

LESLIE LEWIS
Center for Educational Assessment
P.O. Box 25308
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

JOSEPH W. LICATA
Valdosta State College
Valdosta, GA 31601

JOHN LIEVORE
Administrative Director
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

RUTH B. LOVE
Superintendent of Schools
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

ROBERT A. LUKE
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

DAVID L. LUSK
Assistant Dean
College of Human Development & Learning
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

RHODY McCOY
Director Teacher Education
University of San Francisco
Golden Gate & Parker Avenues
San Francisco, CA

BETTY McNAMARA
3064 Arguello Drive
Burlingame, CA 94010

GLENN McCLATHERY
Teachers Corps Project
University of Colorado
1100 14th Street
Denver, CO 80202

JOHN MASCI
Teacher Corps
Loretto Heights College
3001 South Federal Boulevard
Denver, CO 80236

KARL MASSANARI
Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

NANCY MAYEDA
Teacher Learning Center
500 Corbett Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94114

RICHARD MEDER
Teacher Learning Center
500 Corbett Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94114

JAN MENDELSOHN
President
Oakland Education Association
270 East 12th Street
Oakland, CA 94606

PAMELA K. METZ
Teacher Corps
University of Colorado at Denver
1100 14th Street
Denver, CO 80202

ROBERT MULLIGAN
Deputy Assistant Regional Commissioner
Federal Building
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

ELAINE MYERS
Pomona School District
Pomona, CA 91766

ROBERT NEUHARD
Director of Student Teaching
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

DON NEVILLE
Professor of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

JAMES NORWOOD
Bay Area Learning Center Staff
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

DONALD ORLOSKY
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

WILLIAM PARRISH
Director, Teacher Corps
Cullman County Area Vocational Center
Cullman, AL 35055

JOHN W. PEIGHTEL
Assistant Professor of Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

MARIANNE PETRONI
Teacher Learning Center
500 Corbett Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94114

DICK PRESCOTT
Teacher Corps
O. H. Close School
PO Box 5500
Stockton, CA 95205

KENNETH WAYNE PRUITT
116 Quinby Circle
Florence, SC 29501

JOHN READING
Mayor, City of Oakland
Oakland City Hall
Oakland, CA 94612

TOM G. REID
Phoenix Union High School System
2526 West Osborn Road
Phoenix, AZ 85017

PETER R. ROACH
Teacher Corps
249 High Street
Hartford, CT 06103

SUSAN ROPER
Inservice Coordinator
Stanford/Hoover Teacher Corps Project
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

WALTER ROWSON
Principal, Montclair Elementary School
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

JOSEPH M. SAMUELS
Professor of Education
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

AUDREY SANCHEZ
Teacher Learning Center
500 Corbett Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94114

LOTTE SCHILLER
Tamalpais Board of Education
22 Madrone Park Circle
Mill Valley, CA 94941

ALLEN SCHMIEDER
USOE/NCIES, Room 5652, ROB 3
7th & D Streets, SW
Washington, DC 20202

GENE SHIPLEY
Phoenix Union High School System
2526 West Osborn
Phoenix, AZ 85017

WAYMAN B. SHIVER, JR.
Miles College
Birmingham, AL 35208

FRANK SHULTZ
Associate Area Superintendent
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

JEAN SIMMS
Teachers' Center Exchange
Far West Laboratory for
Educational Research & Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

ALAN SINCLAIR
Rhode Island Teacher Center
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908

PHYLLIS SMALLJOHN
Teacher Education
Boise State University
1910 College Boulevard
Boise, ID 83725

SHIRLEY SORENSON
Colton Joint Unified School District
1212 Valencia
Colton, CA 92324

BILLIE STARKS
Bay Area Learning Center Staff
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

JOHN G. TAYLOR
Department of Instruction & Learning
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

BEN TOM
Vice President
San Francisco Board of Education
135 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

BO-GAY TONG
Curriculum Inquiry Center
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90024

CECIL TRUEBLOOD
Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

ANTHONY TRUJILLO
Superintendent of Schools
Tamalpais Unified School District
PO Box 605
Larkspur, CA 94939

DAVID TUCKER
President, Oakland Board of Education
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

CARL J. WALLEN
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281

ROBERT C. WATERMAN
Eastern Montana College
1500 North 30th
Billings, MT 59101

ELIZABETH WATERS S.N.D.
University of Dayton
300 College Avenue
Dayton, OH 45469

JOHN WATERS
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

GRANT WICKARD
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant
Denver, CO 80222

JUDY WILCZAK
Teacher Corps
Research and Development Center
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

ALMA WILLIAMS
Research Department
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

LAVAL WILSON
Superintendent of Schools
Berkeley Unified School District
1414 Walnut
Berkeley, CA 94709

CAROL WORTHINGTON
Staff Development System
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

HERBERT WU
Castlemont High School
Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

READER RESPONSE

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a nationwide information system of the National Institute of Education, whose basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents in education, and to publicize the availability of such documents. Through a network of specialized clearinghouses, ERIC gathers, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes these materials, and processes them into a central computerized data system. The scope of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is the preparation and continuing development of education personnel, as well as selected aspects of health education, physical education, and recreation education.

We are convinced that the knowledge base about Teacher Centers is in need of expansion, and that the profession, collectively and individually, has a responsibility to help in this endeavor. We are encouraging you, therefore, to submit to us any manuscript you have developed on this topic, and to encourage your colleagues to do the same.

We need a reproducible copy (two copies, if available) of any materials and, if possible, a brief abstract. Documents submitted are selected on the basis of their relevance to the current needs of the field. Those accepted are abstracted and indexed in the monthly journal, Resources in Education (RIE), and are made available in microfiche at over 600 locations and reproduced in xerographic form through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Copyrighted materials will receive only an announcement in RIE if permission to reproduce is not received.

Documents announced in RIE typically are unpublished or of limited distribution, and include research reports, program descriptions, speeches, annotated bibliographies, and curriculum guides. Dissertations available elsewhere are not announced in RIE.

We believe there are benefits in submitting documents to ERIC. Your research will be widely publicized since more than 5,300 organizations subscribe to Resources in Education. Publications that have limited distribution or are out of print can continuously be made available to readers through the microfiche collections and reproduction service. And you will be performing a professional service for your colleagues.

Please send relevant documents to:

Information Analyst
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

LOCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Betty McNamara, San Francisco Unified School District (Co-Chairperson)
Marie Fielder, Berkeley Unified School District (Co-Chairperson)
Audrey Guess, Oakland Unified School District
Frederick Kennedy, San Francisco Unified School District
Nancy Mayeda, San Francisco Unified School District
Jay Ball, Berkeley Unified School District
Kathleen Devaney, Teachers' Centers Exchange/Far West Lab
San Francisco
Bruce Joyce, Stanford University
Nancy Bellard, Berkeley Unified School District

NATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Allen Schmieder, U.S. Office of Education
Edward Dambruch, Rhode Island Teacher Center
Kyle Killough, Texas Education Agency
Larry Hutchins, National Institute of Education
Drew Lebby, National Institute of Education
Charles Haughey, National Institute of Education
Mary Harahan, National Institute of Education
Jean Narayana, U.S. Office of Education
Priscilla Hilliard, National Institute of Education
Frank Sobol, National Institute of Education

BAY AREA LEARNING CENTER ADVISORY BOARD

Nancy Bellard, Anne Gay, Etsuko Steimetz--Berkeley
Viola Babb, Gloria Chew, Glenn Allison--Oakland
Betty McNamara, Richard Soto, Valerie Tulier--San Francisco